



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,227	02/13/2004	Jean Geoffrion	275401.1	2508
70696	7590	05/12/2008	EXAMINER	
FASKEN MARTINEAU DUMOULIN, LLP			KEEFER, MICHAEL E	
STOCK EXCHANGE TOWER, SUITE 3400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 242, 800 PLACE VICTORIA				2154
MONTREAL, QC H4Z 1E9				
CANADA				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/12/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/777,227	Applicant(s) GEOFFRION, JEAN
	Examiner MICHAEL E. KEEFER	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-4, 6-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-146/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed 2/4/2008. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-20 are pending. Claims 2, 5, and 21-24 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 14-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Ahmed et al. (EP 1137224), hereafter Ahmed.

4. Claims 1, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. (US 683865), hereafter Garcia.

Regarding **claims 1 and 16** Garcia discloses:

A method for establishing a communication link from a first processing unit located in a first network to a second processing unit located in a second network, through a wireless network comprising a plurality of nodes, said method comprising: (Fig. 1, Gateways are IR16d 16e, IR16A and IR16B, processing units are 22A-C, plus devices in internet 14 and subnet 12C)

in a first gateway, selecting one of a plurality of dynamic routes between the nodes to access a second gateway, the first gateway adapted for accessing the wireless network and said first processing unit, the second gateway adapted for accessing the wireless network and said second processing unit; and

establishing a tunnel between the first gateway and the second gateway using the selected route to thereby establish said communication link. (Col. 11, lines 1-25 disclose finding a plurality of routes to a destination (the broadcast search can return multiple routes), which the gateway which broadcast the search request can then use to directly route packets through the wireless network to its destination, i.e. a tunnel.)

Generating the dynamic routes using each of said plurality of nodes (since the search described in Col. 11 lines 1-25 will replicate searches throughout the entire network, all nodes are considered for dynamic routing.)

Garcia does not specifically disclose detecting a neighboring node, collecting data identifying the detected node, and transmitting the data.

Regarding **claim 3 as applied to claims 1-2**, Garcia discloses:

Broadcasting a request for route generation. (the router broadcasts the search request to all adjacent nodes.)

Regarding **claim 6**, Garcia discloses:

Performing a broadcast from the gateway wherein the generating is performed in response to the broadcast. (Col. 11, the router broadcasts the search request to all adjacent nodes, which reply with path data.)

Regarding **claims 9-10**, Garcia discloses:

Identifying paths based upon criteria, including bandwidth, reliability, or node cost. (Garcia discloses using the protocols in 09/418,700, now US 6836463, of which Col. 8 describes the information that nodes keep about

themselves and other nodes, which includes types of service and the cost of using the nodes.)

Regarding **claim 11 as applied to claim 1**, Garcia discloses:

That the choice of path is determined based upon a criteria (Col. 10 lines 53-63 discloses that multiple routing entries for the same destination are provided, multiple entries may be provided for different types (classes) of service.)

Regarding **claim 12 as applied to claims 1 and 11**, Garcia discloses:

That the choice of path is determined based upon bandwidth, reliability and cost of using each node. (Col. 10 lines 53-63 discloses that multiple routing entries for the same destination are provided, multiple entries may be provided for different types (classes) of service, which may require certain bandwidth or cost metrics.)

Regarding **claims 14 and 15 as applied to claim 1**, Garcia discloses:

The first network comprises the internet (a WAN). (See Fig. 1, the internet)

Regarding **claim 17 as applied to claim 16**, Garcia discloses:

The wireless module comprises a point to point wireless communication module. (Col. 9 lines 43-52 discloses that the IRs are wireless communication devices.)

Regarding **claim 19, as applied to claim 16**, Garcia discloses:

A memory storing dynamically established routes between wireless nodes.
(Col 10 lines 28-67 through Col 11 line 25) describe a variety of ways for
the wireless nodes to store route information in memory)

Garcia discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 3-4, and 6-12, and 14-17 except
for:

Updating the dynamic routes randomly in time (claims 4 and 7), the route
generating protocol of claims 1, 6, and 8.

Ahmed teaches a routing protocol for use in mobile ad-hoc networks,
which causes nodes to transmit information about themselves and their nearest
neighbors to adjacent nodes. ([0031], note that both the link list (i.e. the nearest
K neighbors) and information about each node is transmitted through the
network.

Ahmed also teaches an route update method based off of a random (t1
and t2) period of time in [0034].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
the invention to combine Garcia with Ahmed in order to reduce the size of routing
tables by including fewer entries.

5. **Claims 13 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Garcia and Ahmed as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of
Tuomenoksa et al. (US 2002/0023210), hereafter Tuomenoksa.

Garcia and Ahmed teach all of the limitations of claims 13 and 18 except for
creating an encrypted tunnel between the gateways.

The general concept of creating encrypted tunnels between gateways is well known in the art as taught by Tuomenoksa. ([0186] teaches creating an encrypted tunnel between two gateways)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Garcia and Ahmed with the general concept of creating encrypted tunnels between gateways as taught by Tuomenoksa in order to increase security.

6. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia and Ahmed as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Garcia does not explicitly teach that LAN 20, the link between router 18 and Internet 14, or LAN 26 are Ethernet links.

The Examiner takes Official notice that the general concept of using Ethernet as a LAN protocol or as a link into the Internet is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Garcia and Ahmed with the the general concept that Ethernet is a well-known LAN and Internet layer 1 protocol in order to make the network more standardized.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are moot as those rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Regarding Applicant's arguments about the obviousness of claim 1 in view of Garcia:

8. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., what network layer the system/method is operating at, not requiring knowledge of all nodes on the network, etc.) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

9. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). (The Examiner notes that Applicant has only argued that the claims are not obvious in view of Garcia alone, not in view of the combination of Garcia and Ahmed.)

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2154

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154